

THE
JESUITS REASONS
Unreasonable:
OR,
DOUBTS
Proposed to the
JESUITS

Upon their Paper presented to divers Persons of Honour, for Non-Exception from the Common Favour Voted to Catholicks.

JOHN I. 12.

Tollite me, & mittite in mare, & cessabit mare à vobis: scio enim ego quoniam propter me tempestas hæc grandis venit super vos.

London, Printed Anno Dom. MDCLXXXVIII.

I

Rea-

三三

160-8173329

Collected and kept in a
private collection for 10 years
and only recently
published as it is very rare.

1972-1973, 10th Annual Report

Reasons why the Jesuits hope that they should partake of the favour shewed to other Priests, in taking away the Sanguinary Laws.

THE same Reasons, which moved the Peers to take away the Sanguinary Laws from other Priests, may move them also, to take them away in respect of the Jesuits, for the Jesuits are freeborn Subjects as well as others; they have been as faithfull to this Majesty as others; they are of tender Conscience as well as others. The Jesuits all along have been furtherers of the King, and Actors also as far as their Function beareth; that is, they were in the Camp where some of them were killed, others imprisoned, most of them lost their nearest Relations in the War, and in manner, all had their Friends undone for the King. All those that depended on the Jesuits stood constant for the King, even to death; amongst these were some signal persons, as Sir Henry Gage, Sir John Smith, Sir John Digby, and others, who having been formerly Scholars of the Jesuits, were actually, when they dyed, Penitents of the Jesuits, and Mr. Peter Wright who was executed at Tyburn, for a Jesuit, was particularly maligned because he was Sir Henry Gage his Priest. As for Noble persons who lost great Estates, and endured much hardship for his Majesty, the late Duke of Buckingham, the late Marques of Worcester, the late Earl of Shrewsbury, were Penitents of the Society, as other prime Nobility yet in being.

Now whereas two things are objected against the Jesuits, they can be easily answered; First, it is objected that the Jesuits teach the Doctrine of the Pope deposing Kings. It is answered, That no Community can be less accused of that Doctrine, than the Jesuits. It is true, four or five Jesuits did many years ago teach that Doctrine, as they had found it taught by others, ancienter than their Order. But since the first of January 1616. the General of the Jesuits forbade any of his to teach, preach, or dispute for that Doctrine, or print any thing for it, to take away the aspersion which the Writings of some few have brought upon the Society. And now actually all

Jesuits are obliged under pain of damnation, not to teach that Doctrine either in word, writing, or print, which none in the Church but they only are.

Secondly, 'Tis objected that the Jesuits do particularly depend on the Pope. It is answered, That they are obliged by a particular vow to be ready to go even to the utmost bounds of the Earth, to preach the Gospel to Infidels, when the Pope shall think it fit to send them; and they have no other Vow, which doth particularly oblige them but this, which can prejudice no Kingdom. On the other side, speaking of their dependenc (which may byas their affections) they have at least dependence of the Pope, of any Church-men, for they are by his special Vow excluded from all Benefices, and Dignities, by which the Pope may win the affection of other Church-men.

As for what is said of the Venetians and French banishing the Jesuits, it is answered that both those Estates have repealed their Acts.

Lastly, That the Jesuits being willing to submit to whatsoever all other Catholick Priests shall agree to, and offering all the service which others offer, they hope they may be partakers of the same favours which shall be granted to others; that so, that mercy may extend to all, and the World may see that the Sanguinary Law is truly taken away.

P R E F A C E.

I Expect Censures and Clamours as loud as can be against me, of uncharitable, uncatholick, unchristian, &c. for seeming to lay load upon the already oppressed, and contribute to, and even provoke a persecution against our Fellow Catholicks. I think I have said my worst against my self: let me see how I can justify my action. Premising therefore that the case of you Jesuits is apprehended by your selves, and your Abettors already desperate, and your Exclusion remediless, and so cannot be said to spring from this Paper of mine; I address to my Defence, and offer my Motives why I publish this little Treatise against you.

My first is, To wipe off the aspersion laid upon Gods Church by some Tenets of yours; and strongly fastened on it by your haughty calling only your selves the Catholick Church, and all dissenters from your Tenets, Hereticks.

My second, Because I understand you are about to make the common good stoop to the Particular one of your Order: as is your constant practice; contrary to the Law of Nature, and Principles of Christianity. For I have been informed that you in a boasting manner affirm, the Parliament will proceed no farther about taking away the Sanguinary Laws: and that some friends of yours endeavour to make it believed that it is not for his Majesties interest to make good his solemn promise from Breda, of having regard to tender Consciences.

My third is, Your stomachfull frustrating my expectation. For I was really glad when I heard you had published Apologetical Reasons why you should not be excepted; hoping you would sincerely renounce the criminal Doctrines and Actions of your Predecessors, and free Religion from scandal. But finding no such thing, per verba de praesenti, but on the contrary, a comparing and preferring your selves before others: I thought my self obliged to do right to the Common Cause.

My fourth, to oblige you to repentance, and a hearty retraction of your unlawful Tenets and Practices; that so you may deserve and have

P R E F A C E.

have as much favour as others ; which is the worst I wish you : and not to wrong your own Credits and Consciences, and fool others with dissembling shews of loyalty, which every one may see to be mere hypocrisie.

My fifth, Because I owe that duty to the Civil Magistrate, whose hearty Subject I am, to resent a mockery put upon him (as this your Paper will appear to be) under colour of offering satisfaction : Every true hearted Subject owing his best endeavour to his King and Country, that none lurk among them, unless their faltring Principles of Equivocation and disloyalty be purged out.

My sixth, To offer even your selves an advantage, if your courage and cause will stretch to improve it. For the following Doubts are, many of them, such as Protestants themselves urge against your Reasons : and are communicated here to you, partly on purpose that you may provide better satisfaction.

My last (to satisfy even the passionate too) is, Because your unchristian spirit of Calumny is still as unquiet as ever ; having, of late, most unjustly aspersed Principal Persons of almost every Body but your own ; which comportment of yours makes it but fit, if Truth and the Common Good favour you not, neither should I. To think and declare thus much satisfies me ; if it do not others, I cannot help it. Only I wish your favourers to beware of doing any thing that may be interpreted an abatement of you, till you approve your selves heartily loyal ; lest they discover themselves too deeply tainted with your Principles and Tempor.

DOUBTS.

D O U B T S.

To begin then. My first Doubt shall be, Whether you *Jesuits* have ground to hope the same favour with others. For, if you, by your unjust and wicked practices provoked the Magistrates to enact those Laws: if the rest of Priests and Catholicks were by you plunged in such miseries, upon discovery of your Negotiations, which were impure to the whole Body of them, how can you be thought to deserve remission, whose seditious Principles are too deeply guilty of the Blood of Priests and Catholicks shed in the Kingdom ever since you first came into it? Those who know your practices in the Countries, where you, by the means, ordinarily, of deluded Wives, govern the Great Ones, know this to be your Maxime, to manage Religion, not by perswasion, but by command and force. This Principle did your chief Apostle of *England*, *Robert Parsons*, bring in with him. His first endeavours were to make a list of Catholicks, which, under the conduct of the Duke of *Guise*, should have changed the state of the Kingdom, using for it the presence of the Title of *Queen Mary of Scotland*. But, her Council at *Paris*, which understood busines better, were so sensible of his boldnes, that they took from him the Queens Cypher which he had purloyned, and commanded him never more to meddle in her affairs. Poor *Edmund Campian*, who is generally accounted an innocent and learned man, and others suffered for such practices of his.

Parsons's endeavours being suppressed by this Queen, he turned himself to the *Spaniard*, and, with all his might, fostered the Invasion of *Eighty eight*, which is known to have been another occasion of Sanguinary Laws. He wrote, on that occasion, his *Dolman*, to justifie the *Spaniards* Title to *England*, degrading the Scottish succession and Title of our Sovereign. He wrote also *Leicester's Common-wealth* (at that time called commonly *Blewcoat*, because it was sent into *England* bound in blew paper) which extremely exasperated the State, and augmented its indignation against Catholicks. The same man, at *Queen Elizabeth's* death, procured a *Bull* from the Pope to the Catholicks in *England* against *King James*; to hinder his coming to the

the Crown, unlets he would give liberty of Conscience, and, as his friends gave out, had twenty thousand men listed for that effect, had not his Majesty prevented the danger with sweet words.

Next followed that detestable Machination of blowing up that Royal Race, and the whole Nobility, with the Houle of Commons, which was the occasion of the Oath of Allegiance, and all the Persecution of Catholicks following upon it: King *James* professing, not to persecute for Religion, but for Treason. This you alledge not to be, originally, your Invention; but, is it no guilt to follow another mans wickedness, when it leadeth to so horrid a crime? For, without doubt, both by prayers before hand, and by publick testifications after the Fact was discovered, you were highly accessary to it: nay, many years after you did, and peradventure to this very day still do pertinaciously adhere to it. I could urge great and manifest instances of this, were it not to lose time. That monstrous *Straw*, of which all Christendom rung so long, and the Pictures of *Garme* and *Oldcorne* cannot be denied, nor want they evidence of your inward minds.

After these came out the ridiculous and satyrical Books against King *James*, the *Corona Regiae*, and the *Querries*. And yet your so well affected spirits could not be at rest, till your Patriarch *Parsons* was shamefully turned out of *Rome* by Monsieur *Bebus*, the French Ambassador, and order from the King of *France*, being discovered to plot a new Treason against his Country to introduce the Duke of *Parma*. Thus you followed King *James* to his death.

Direct Treason against King *Charles*, of glorious memory, before the Wars, I cannot accuse you of: but, how refractory you were to the Queens desires and orders at *Rome*, for his late Majesties assistance, is well known; and what you have done since the beginning of the Wars, and how you have behaved your selves, both in and out of *England*, is fitter for me to remit to his Majesty, and the Courts Informations, than to engage my pen in far fewer and weaker which I could produce. Only I shall add this word; If Colonel *Hutchinson* were well examined and pressed, he would perhaps discover strange secrets, abour your treating with *Cromwel*, no doubt much to his Majesties advantage. So that, leaving you this *Doubt* to rumin-

nate upon, whether the condition of them, who have guiltily provoked and deserved the Sanguinary Laws, be the same with theirs who have have suffered for being mistaken to be their Fellows; I proceed to

2. *My Second Doubt*, about your first Reason. That the *Jesuits* are free-born Subjects as well as others. In which, methinks, I find one of your usual sleights of *Equivocation*. For, a *Jesuit* may signify the man who is a *Jesuit*; and may signify, with the complexion of being a *Jesuit*. In the former sense there is no difference between any other Priest, Regular or Secular, and a *Jesuit*, as to free-born; but, in the second, there's a wide one. For, the others have nothing against them, but such Laws as had their beginning from difference in Religion: their degrees and communities having been accepted by the Laws of the Kingdom; in virtue of which they are free born Subjects and parts of the Common-wealth, as far as difference of Religion permits.

Now, it being the Law of *England* that no Ecclesiastical Community may sett'e here, unless admitted by the Civil Power, (as we see in proportion, practised in all Catholick Estates) and *Jesuits* never having participated of this favour, all your practices of usurping Jurisdiction, making Colledges and Provinces in or for *England*, possessing your selves of great sums of monies for such ends; and the like actions, have been hitherto all usurpations, unlawfull both in respect of the Donors and Acceptors. 'Tis unlawfull for any man (even according to the sense and practice of Catholick times) by virtue of your priviledges, to live, or preach in *England*, or any of his Majesties Dominions: and whoever entertains you in such quality, is subject to the penalties ordained by the Ancient Laws. Neither, without some main Reason which might force the aforesaid Statute, ought you to hope or attempt any further stay in *England*, in way of a Body, till first you have obtained particular grace from the Civil Magistrate.

3. *My Third Doubt is*, Whether you have been as faithfull to his Majesty as others; Which is your second Reason. For which I must note a Maxim or Practice found among you *Jesuits*, and acknowledged by all who look into your ways; which is, in quarrels of Princes and great Men, to have some of your Fathers on one part, and others for the contrary. Which as I no

ways deny to be very politickly done, and to shew that you are *Wiser than the Children of light*; so, on the other side, I affirm 'tis a manifest sign you are faithfull to neither. I speak not this as to single men, (if there be any among you who prefer your loyalty to your Prince before obedience to your Superior) but as to the Community or Superiors, who give this direction or connivence to their single Subjects, to act on both sides; by which they are convinced of acknowledging duty to neither, but to work for their own interests. Nor can the like be impeded to other Communities, whose obedience is more rational and free; without obligation to follow their Superiors Judgments further than to the observation of Canons and Rules.

4. My Fourth Doubt is, Whether you are (as you say) *tender Consciences as well as others*: (your third Reason) in which I remit him who desires a further information, to *The Mystery of Jesuitism*, translated some years since out of *French*: The Authour whereof is both learned in your Divinity, and an upright and scrupulous *Roman Catholick*, as his Book manifest where every indifferent Reader may see, as clear as noonday, that your Conscience is so tender as to stretch to all kind of Villanies, by the award of that Theological Bawd, commonly called *Probability*, by which whatever three Divines hold (or, perhaps, one) is accounted *Probable* and lawfull to be practis'd; and whoever understands any whit of the world, knows you General can, with a whist, raise whole Legions of Divines to speak what he has a mind should pass for *probable*; nay, even Provincial can raise above three to make it *de fide*. The World has seen the experience, about *Depositing Princes*, *Equivocational Reservations*, and divers other juggles.

Although this seems enough for this point, yet it is not amiss to add a Maxime of obedience which you have among you, *That the Subject ought blindly to obey his Superior without examination, whenever it is probable there's no sin in the action*. Out of which perswasion, if three Divines at the most, say, thing may be done, which the Superior will have done; is not in a Subject's power, under pain of damnation, to refuse to do it. Whereby 'tis plain, the tenderness of your Conscience is only about doing or not doing what your Superior orders you.

5. My Fifth Doubt, concerning your Fourth Reason, is, wheth-

ther all you say proves any heartiness for his Majesty. For, I question not the truth of all this, but the *Quere* remains, whether your *Jesuits* were the first movers, or the Gentry which did the King service, to whom you adhered for not losing your places, and interest you had in the parties. Had you pleaded that any of this Gentry which you name, was unwilling of himself, and his *Jesuit* had induced him, or made him constant when he would have relented, this reason had been somewhat strong: now, 'tis one of the probable Arguments which are subject to be turned to what pleases the Orator.

But to speak somewhat to particulars; 'Tis known Col. Gage's relations were to others more than to you; and I could name by whose solicitation he took arms for the King, who was not of your Coat. As for Sir John Digby, there are alive who know by whom he was armed, and sent to the Kings Party, in whom you had not so great interest. Concerning the Noble Persons you name, though you had the industry to make your selves their *Ordinaries*, yet were they not, for the most part, so addicted to you, that they had not great Relations to other Ecclesiastical Bodies. So that it may appear, their own inclinations, and not your persuasions (as far as is clear) were their motives to follow the Kings Party. I could say more, were it fitting to enter upon private mens particular actions. And so much to your Reasons.

6. My Sixth Doubt concerns the Answer to the first Objecti-
on, Whether *Jesuits* teach the *Doctrine of the Popes deposing Kings*.
My Doubt is, what your Answēr is, whether ay or no? for I
can find neither. First, you compare your Body to others,
which is no Answēr to the Question, but a spitefull and envious
diversion, to examine others actions, who are sufficiently clear-
ed, because not questioned. Secondly, you tell us that some
Jesuits did teach it; but that, since the first of January 1616. your
General has forbidden any of his, to teach, preach, or dispute for
this *Doctrine*; which answers not the Question, and is a thing I
am prone to believe. For I have been informed, that 'tis a
known practice of your *Society*, that your Generals should for-
bid some actions, which they are not unwilling their Subjects
should practise, to the end that they may reject weak men, by
saying it cannot be true, because they have a Rule against it; and
to more understanding Parties they may excuse the fault, by

The Jesuits Reasons Unreasonable.

laying the defect on Particulars, who will not obey their commands.

But, I must farther note a cunning in this Answer. For true it is, the Parliament of *Paris* ordered the principal *Jesuits* to get such an order from their *General*, for *France*; upon which I suppose, you buil'd your answer: not explicating whether it reaches to other Countries, as particularly to *England*, which I never heard so much as pretended: and therefore it answen nothing to the real Question, unless you produce the extenson to the whole World; which you cannot do; since 'tis plain, *Santarellus*'s Book was printed in *Rome* about ten years after, 1616. teaching the power of Depositing in all latitude. Wherefore either *Santarellus*'s fact was a manifest disobedience to the nose of his *General*, or the answer given, an open Imposture, making a special Decree for *France* a general one, and so your answer fallacious and none. No more than your fair inference, that all *Jesuits* are bound under pain of *damnation*, not to teach that Doctrine; which is a pure slur you use to put upon men unaccustomed to your ways: whereas 'tis a known position of yours, that none of your Rules bind under so much as a *venial* sin, much less under *damnation*.

And it seems you think there's no Mortal sin, but Disobedience, or you esteem the Doctrine good, though forbidden; else you would not have added that Clause, that *None in the Church but you, were bound under pain of Damnation, not to teach that Doctrine*: whereas all good Christians think it damnable to teach any wicked Doctrine, such as this is declared to be by all *France*. I wish to God you would instance in what Sermons or serious Discourses any of you have argued against this Doctrine; out of which it might be gathered, that in your heart you dislike it. I hear you and yours have much exclaimed against some even late Pamphlets that touch the Oath of Allegiance; though none of those Books (as far as I understand) press the taking of the Oath it self, in its present terms, but only oppose this King-dethroning Doctrine. Surely, unless you declare your selves farther, this must cause a main suspicion, that you dislike the Oath, not as Moderate Catholicks do, for the ambiguity of the expression, but because the Doctrine of *Deposition* pleases you.

And why should the Peace of Kingdoms, and the quiet

all Christendom depend upon your Generals Order, for that's all the security I can find your Paper gives us? who will assure us your Generals Order may not alter to morrow, and that which you call now a mortal sin to do, becomes then as mortal a sin not to do? and has not then the World reason to fear that, where and when the interest of your Body will either dispense with your obedience to your General, or prevail so far with him as to revoke the Prohibition you speak of, you will be ready again to maintain the same Depositing Power with as much fiercenes as those few whom you now seem to disown?

For, who are those few? *Bellarmino*, of whom one of your Society (though in Prison when he spake it) said, King *James* was no more to be compared to *Bellarmino*, than *Balaams Ass* to *Balaam*: *Suarez*, whom you esteem the Master of the World: *Dissius*, under the name of *Singleton*: *Fitzherbert* the chief, in his time, of your English Writers: *Patriarch Parsons*, *Mariana*, *Salmeron*, *Becanus*, *Vasquez*; *Omnes Capita alta ferentes*, and of whom you will renounce none for less than being frightned to lose a Province; as when, in *France*, you were threatened to be put out, if you had not condemned *Suarez* and *Santarellus*: With these deserves to be ranked, for his Merits in the same kind, *F. Symonds*, of a far later date, who procured to be condemned at *Rome* those three Propositions (expressed in the *Christian Moderator*) of which the first was expressly made to disclaim the Popes power in absolving Subjects from their Obedience to the Civil Government. Are all these but *four or five*? Nay, I could reckon up above four or five besides all these: so that, there is no farther security of your not preaching this Doctrine, than untill the Pope please to attempt again the Deposition of some King of *England*: for then no doubt but your Generals Decree will be released, and the interest of your Order to preach this Doctrine again.

As to that perverse and unseasonable insinuation, that *Others*, too, have defended the Popes deposing power, as well as you: I answer, perhaps Flattery or Errors may have prevailed so far with some others besides *Jesuits*: yet, with this difference in the point we now treat: some persons of other Communities have written for that exorbitant power in the Pope, and very many, and far more against it: not only the faculties of *Paris* and *Sorbonne*, but seven or eight whole Universities in *France*, have

have unanimously and solemnly condemned it : All this while, what single *Jesuit* has spoken one unkind word against it ? though both particularly suspected, and highly concerned to clear themselves: Cry you mercy ! you there subscribed also their condemnation of it. But why find I not that alledged here, if there be not some juggle in't? Sure you would not have waved urging it among your best Reasons, did not your heart disavow that forced compliance then, and so hate the *Medium* for the Conclusions sake. Your Generals Prohibition (as your Reasons seem to express it) is, *Not to teach, &c.*, that *Doctrine*; and then you are free, at least to teach, &c. the contrary; which who of you ever did so much as in a private Conference? Nor will it help you, if your Generals Prohibition be to speak either for or against that Opinion (which I believe is the truth, though your Reasons craftily dissemble it;) since then you neither have hitherto given, nor can hereafter give the least satisfaction to Princes, without disobeying your General.

Let any one but cast his eye upon *F. Lloyd* (or *Fisher*) a famous man in his generation, and consider what he writes in *Answer to the Nine Points*. *That he omitted the discussion of the Ninth Point*, about the Pope's Authority to depose Kings; *for*, being bound by the command of his General given to the whole Order, *not to publish any thing*, of that Argument, *without sending the same first to Rome*, to be reviewed and approved; *his Answer to that Point could not have been performed without very long expatition and delay*. And so goes on; referring His Majesty and the Reader in general, to the *Treatises* lately written on that Subject, to which, said he, *Tis not needfull any thing should be added*. And, I ask, first, is not this *Jesuits* proceeding with his King extremely, both uncivil and disloyal too? his Majesty commands an English *Jesuit* to write concerning the *Opinion of depositing King*, and giving away their Kingdoms by Papal power, whether directly or indirectly: what says the *Jesuit* to this important question, wherein all Princes, and particularly his Majesty was so nearly concerned? He could not answer it without sending it first to *Rome* to be approved, &c. and so excused himself, and made no answer at all; which now of these two will you guess was the *Jesuits* supreme Sovereign, the King or his General? Nor should I have stayed so long upon the example of one particular *Jesuit*, though never so eminent among them, but that by these

The Jesuits Reasons Unreasonable.

73

their Reasons, I see they all cleave to the same Principle, of not meddling with this point, whatever it costs them, without leave of their General.

Secondly, I ask concerning those late Treatises here mentioned by the Jesuit; were they not those very Books which *Paris* and so many whole Universities of *France* publickly condemned? I have this motive to think so; *F. Fisher* wrote this Book 1626. these Treatises were that very year condemned, and some of them, as *Santarellus* printed but the year before. But, that *F. Fisher* adhered to the affirmative of the Popes deposing power, is clearly evident by his other excuse, that *commonly Kings are not willing to hear the proofs of coercive Authority over them, &c.* As also, when his Adversary objected, that *Suarez's* Book was burnt by the Hangman, he answers (far from disliking his Brother *Jesuit*) in these peremptory words; *I likewise demand of you, says Fisher, if Jesuit Suarez his Book be prejudicial to Princely Authority, why is the same allowed in all other Catholick Kingdoms, &c?* Does this sound, as if the *Jesuits* had changed their inclination to that Doctrine; whilst one of their eminentest Writers strives thus to defend, nay, applaud, even *Suarez*, one of the most offensive and extravagant, even, *Jesuits*, that ever medled with that Subject?

7. My Seventh Doubt, is about *your dependence on the Pope*, which you gloriously explicate to consist in this, that *The Jesuits are obliged by a particular Vow, to be ready to go even unto the utmost Bounds of the Earth, to preach the Gospel to Infidels.* I desire to know, by what virtue you explicate your Vow in these words? the terms of your Vow are these, *Insuper promitto speciale Obedientiam summo Pontifici circa missiones*: which, by the tenour of the words, signifies to go whither he shall send you, and do what he shall command you in your Missions. First, there's never a word of preaching the *Gospel*, nor of *Infidels*; and your Missions may be as well to *Catholicks* as to *Infidels*; as we see the *Priest's Mission*, in *France*, for the most part, are employed among *Catholicks*: and I would demand whether your Mission into *England* be not as well to *Catholicks* as to *Protestants*? Wherefore, by this Vow, you are bound to do whatever the Pope commands you: as for example, if the Pope should excommunicate or depose the Prince, and command you to move the *Catholicks* to take Arms; you were bound by your Vow to do

do it. And, therefore, 'tis no wonder if you give the Pope Catalogue of these men, and their qualities, (for they are generally speaking, those who are eminentest in your Order) and brag to him how great an Army of Pens and Tongues you bring devoted to him, to further any attempt or design he shall command.

Besides, is it not well known that none of your Order go into Infidele Countries, but such as desire it, whereof no small part do it for discontentment they find in your Colleges? and that the Pope may as well send one of the Pillars of St. Peter's Church in *Rome*, to preach to Infidels, as one of your professed Fathers, if it be against your Generals, and his own will. Therefore, this *special obedience* is but a flash of vanity above others; by which the Pope has a Chimerical power over you, such as your subtlety in Divinity will call *potentia remota*, which without your own wills, shall never come into *Act*.

Yet do I not think that his *Majesty* will quarrel with you for this Vow, as you explicate it: though to tell you my sense of it, I do not know how it stands with His Prerogative, that the Pope shall have power over his Subjects, which may be used to him, to send them, without his leave, to *Japan* and *China*. But, this Authority you assume to your selves, and further: For, you do not only oblige your Subjects to come in, or go out of the Kingdom, when you command them; but play the Judge of life and death, upon the Kings natural Subjects, without leave, or any crime that, according to Civil Laws, deserves punishment. You presume by your power, to send them to *Waten*, or some such place, wherein either your selves have high Justice, or the high Justice is at your Devotion, there frame Process against them, and execute them, without making account to His Majesty, of the life of his Subject, for pretended crimes committed in *England*.

This (taking the whole story together) I conceive to be less than making your selves Sovereigns over His Majestys Subjects, that is, to be an *Act of High Treason*. Yet, all parts of this Action are evidently in your hands, in virtue of your obedience, and your having such places of high Justice in your Command: so that your Subjects have other Sovereigns than the *King's Majesty*, whom, by consequence, they ought to fear more than him, since their power is more immediate, and

prelling

prelling and pressed on their Consciences. As for the practice, 'tis said to have been used upon one *Thomas Barton*, an eminent Scholar among you, who wrote a Book called *The Agreement of Faith and Reason*. How true it is, I undertake not to justify; but if you'll justify your selves from High Treason, it behoves you to produce the man. And so you have my seventh *Doubt*.

8. My Eighth *Doubt* is, that you equivocate with us in this word *Dependence*: for you turn it to be dependence by *Vow*, whereas more likely it means dependence of *Interest*, and signifies, that 'tis your interest to ingage the Pope to you, by maintaining all height of Supreme Authority in him, though it be never so irrational and against God's Law. For, by so doing, you also can use it all for your own Interest, in procuring for your selves and friends whatever lies either in the Popes Authority or Grace, as Exemptions, Priviledges, Benefices, &c. For, men look not on your Body as on others, whose Generals have no other power than according to their Rules, to look to their Discipline: But on you they look as on an Army managed by one man; whose Weapons are Pens and Tongues; and the Arts of Negotiation, and all plausible means of commending your selves to the World. Which you exercise in such a height, as to have had the boldness to threaten the Pope with a Schism; to tell the King of *Spain* your Tongues and Pens had gotten him more Dominions than his Armies; to attempt breaking the Liberties of *Venice*; to be able to raise Seditions in most Countries; and to be dreadfull to the very Kings and Princes. And all this, because, as Christ proposed to his Disciples the love of one another, for the Badge of Christianity; so, your Generals propose to you blind obedience for the Badge of a *Jesuit*; that is, by co-operating with them, to make them powerfull and great Lords, and your selves invincible, and terrible to all that oppose you.

For this end you exalt the Popes *Infallibility*; that you may set your Opponents condemned in *Rome*, and then cry them down for *Heresicks*. For this reason you teach, the Pope to have all Authority in the Church, and other Bishops to be but his Deputies, (so joyning with your Brother-Presbyters in *really* destroying the Hierarchy) that, when you, by Grace of usurpation, have purloyn'd a Command from that Court, you may treat all that resist you, as Schismaticks and Rebels to the Church.

Yet if we believe Mr. White (acknowledged an able man) they are both damnable Heresies, and destructive of Faith and Church: and many others also of our most learned, dislike them, though their courage, &c. reaches not to brand them so severely. In this complication of Interests, then, and not in your glorious Vow, consists the dependence you have so specially on the Pope, in a matter not of Religion, but of Temporal power and greatness.

9. My Ninth Doubt is, about the comparison you make between your selves and others; telling us how you are by your Vow, excluded from all Benefices and Dignities, by which the Pope may win the affection of other Church-men. Concerning which I first inquire, whether this be roundly true? I doubt you'd be loth to reject all the Abbeys and Benefices annexed to your Colleges, to verifie this Vow, as you have set it down in your Paper: and therefore the effect of your Vow is only, that private men may not be alienated from your Order, with hope of quiet lives in such Benefices; and not the contempt of the Power, and Honour following it; as is sufficiently testified by another Vow of yours; which is, that, if any of yours, for special reasons, be made Bishop, he shall be bound to be subject to the Provincial, or Rector of the place of his Residence, and to take their advice in the government of his Church; which you extend as far as to Cardinals, to a capacity of which Eminence, notwithstanding your special Vow, your Dispensations easily reach. So that your Vow is no Religious one, of defining Honours; but a politick abuse, mask'd under the veil of Religion, that the abler men of your Order may, not be separated from it, and so the Body may remain the stronger, and your General more potent to resist the Pope himself.

Neither does this any way diminish, but increase your dependence on the Pope; both, because 'tis by him your Houses are furnish'd with Benefices, and those never to return to the Popes Donation; as because you oblige your Friends, by procuring others for them, you being at his elbow, to suggest him or that friend, on whom all his Benefices may be conferred: by which means you get the endearment due to the Pope from those Friends, to the increase of your own power and riches; and your selves still find out new pretended necessities to beg more. So that this *Holy Vow* of yours no ways makes you less subject to the

the Pope, but to suck his paps the harder : as those know, who have seen what passed in *France* and *Flanders* these late years ; especially under the *Archduke Leopold*.

10. Yet have I another Doubt concerning this *Vew* of yours, etc. Whether it does not make you as refractory to Kings and Princes, as to the Pope ? For to speak truth, whatever the Right is in other Countries, in *England*, where the Canons and Concordates with the Pope have been out of use a hundred years, and by consequence, have no force, even in your own Doctors opinions ; and therefore things are to be governed by Nature and Reason : at least, in *England*, I say, all such Benefices and Collations belong more to the King than to the Pope. For, it being clear, that the Offices to which Benefices are annexed, are to be provided of able men ; and who are able men, none can tell that understand not the Office : 'tis plain, that Secular Clergy-men ought to be the chusers of Officers of their kind, Regulars of Regular Superiors ; and by consequence, the Donors of such Benefices.

But, the people first got an influence on the chusing of Bishops, because 'twas rationally believed those would be able to do most good, who were in the peoples good liking. But, when Bishops grew to have great Revenues, and to be esteemed men of so high Quality in the Common-wealth, the Emperors and Kings began to cast an eye on their Election ; and not without reason : for it concerns them that none be in eminent places, but such as they are secured of will breed no disturbance in the Common-wealth. After this, if any Clergy-man had done the King service, he found it the best way of recompence to cause him to be chosen into a place of Authority and Eminency. The Popes title to the giving of Benefices began by his Office of Patriarch of the West ; which, since the Council of *Nice*, he more narrowly looked to the government of ; exhorting and correcting by Letters such Bishops and Churches there, as did not their duties. And this held, till *Pepin* found how efficacious the reverence of the Pope was to make him obeyed, and accepted for King of *France*. Since which time, whether for Ambition, or for security sake, men began to think no Act firm, unless it were ratified at *Rome*.

In times following, the Popes began to have need of Christian Princes : and these found it the sweetest way to help the Popes, by granting imposition upon the Clergy. So came the

first-fruits to the Popes ; and, to assure those Incomes, the custom of having *Bulls* from *Rome* to confirm the Elections of the Clergy; was likewise introduced. So that, this Authority of the Popes comes from the Princes Agreements with them, and not from any Superiority or Power of the Popes. Wherefore, these Agreements being, by time and essential changes, annulled ; all giving of Benefices belong to the Chusers and the King.

I come now to the close. If your renouncing of Benefices make you less subject to the Pope, as you pretend, it makes you in *England* less subject to the King. And, if it makes you more hardly rewardable, and more pressing on the Pope, it will make you the like to Kings. As, in *Leopold's* time, you were so wholly the means for coming to *Benefices*, that hardly a command from *Spain* could take place for any that was not your Confident.

11. My Eleventh Doubt is, how you answer your banishment out of *France* and *Venice*, viz. that *Both these States have repudiated their Acts*. Which answer makes nothing to this, that you ther did not deserve the sentence, or deserved to have it released ; one of which any judicious man would have expected in your hands. Now, to come to particulars ; the *Venetians* were so resolute against you, that they made it Treason for any of their State so much as to motion your return, and refused all others Princes intercessions for you. Till their cause reducing them to fear the slavery of the *Turk*, if they had not the Popes assistance, promised them largely if they would re-admit you, they rather chose to struggle with your Treasons at home, than admit the barbarous conquest of their Dominions. Whether they have cause to repent, or not, I know not ; But, the current news at this present is, that the Pope, who procured your admittance, has ; having found you so unfaithfull to him, notwithstanding all his love to you, insomuch that he's about questioning you, by what means you are so suddenly raised to so great wealth : wherein, I fear, he'll not find obedience so ready as found flattery, when he was to pleasure you.

Your measure in *France* was, indeed, hard ; the fault not proved to be universal but particular ; and so, in divers places, was never executed, and easie to be repealed, having proceeded more out of presumption than proof. But, your act in *England* is far different ; your whole English Congregation following

following their Head, *Parsons*, and maintaining his Acts even since his Death.

12. My *Twelfth Doubt* is, concerning your conclusion, Whether you intend to mend what, hitherto, you have done amiss ; or rather to persist in your Equivocations and Dissimulations. For, first, whereas you being the chiefly or only suspected Body, are therefore bound to offer more satisfaction than others ; you make your Proposition to submit to whatever all other *Catholick Priests* shall agree to : which sounds as much as, if any disagree, you will adhere to them ; or, in plain terms, that you agree to no more than by shame you shall be forced to, for not plainly appearing the worst of Priests and Enemies to the *Catholick Causē*.

13. My *Thirteenth Doubt* is, why you, pretending to be the greatest Divines among *Catholicks*, remit your selves to the determinations of others, and not, as good Subjects ought, examine what satisfaction is necessary and fit to be given the State ; and both offer it your selves, and provoke others to do it, not standing so scrupulously upon your Generals decree, which surely should not be thought to bind in such extreme cases : even the Laws of the Church, and of General Councils we know oblige not, where our obedience would ruin us ; and will you still more precisely observe your own By-Laws, than the sacred Canons of the Universal Church ? Methinks therefore, in due satisfaction concerning the pretences of the Pope against the King ; whatever *Catholick Doctors* hold favourable to Princes, in these differences, should by you be gathered together, and subscribed, and promised to be maintained with all your power. As, first, the *Doctrine*, which denies that the Pope has any Authority in any case to depose, or temporally molest the King, or any of His Majesties Subjects. Likewise that he has no Authority to release any lawfully made Oath of Allegiance, or other promise to his Majesty, or any of his Subjects. And, because none of these, or the like assertions can be strong and firm in the mouth of him that holds the Pope's *Infallibility* in determining points of Faith ; but, whenever the Pope shall determine the contrary, he must renounce what before he held for good : therefore you should do the like in respect of the *Pope's Infallibility*.

Moreover, because, if the Pope, by his own, or any others Authority,

Authority, may force his Majesties Subjects to go into Countries where they cannot enjoy the protection of their Prince, the Subjects are not free to maintain these assertions : therefore, this Position, also, that a *Subject of England is bound to appear before any foreign Tribunal, without His Majesties consent*, is also to be condemned. Nor is it less necessary you should expressly renounce the Doctrines of *Equivocation* and *Mental Reservation* ; without which all the rest afford very little security ; And I could wish you would find some way how to assure us, that, when you solemnly make your disclaim of these last Opinions, you do not practise them even while you renounce them. Unless such Tenets be stubbed out of the heads and tongues of your Preachers, there cannot be expected any hearty Allegiance in the *Jesuit Party*, whose consciences are governed by you ; but such a one as shall waver with every blast from *Rome*.

Neither can any Priest exempt himself from subscribing the condemnation of all these. For, Ignorance of necessary truths is not to be allowed in Teachers. And, supposing that every one knows the Propositions are not Articles of Catholick Faith, the manifest Inconveniences that follow them, will evidently convince they are to be condemned. For, temporal subjection to Princes is the main ground of the peace and good government of the Common-wealth ; and what is against that, is against the Law of God and Nature.

I should think it, therefore, not so much your best, as your only way, to lay aside your private Interests with the Pope, and declare your selves not the last, but the forwardest in your Allegiance to His Majesty, that you may cancel your former proceedings, and blot out the settled Opinion of your Dissimulation. You can do it, if you will ; for you teach men to depose their own private consciences on the Opinions of others. You cannot deny but the contrary Opinions are asserted by Catholick Doctors ; and therefore by your own Maximes, 'tis lawfull for you to hold them, nor will I now dispute those Maximes. It concerns you deeply ; for, you must have a *special favour* from the Civil State : and not to pretend to such, is to profess you break the Catholick Parliament's Statutes, and press the Popes exorbitant Authority, and draws all your adherents into Treason before God and a *Pramunire* by the

the Laws. Think therefore soberly, and conclude strongly what you have to do: and, let not your General's Interest overway Truth and Justice, and your private Good.

Yet one reflection occurs to me worth your notice, rising from the report I toucht at the beginning, That you, seeing your selves shut out from the Favour Voted by the House of Lords, to other Catholicks, are casting about how to stop the progres of that Vote, and prevent its growing into an Act. Whereupon I raise this *Quere*, why you, who are but a particular Body, should not rather take up your roots and transplant; than so to seek your private benefit, that you care not to hazard the whole? Do you not remember how and why you went from *Venice*? you voluntarily departed in pure Obedience to the Pope, upon a quarrel betwixt him and that *State*; and were only kept out, not sentaway: And, were it not now as high a Charity, and as much for your reputation, to yield for a time, till your own deportments shall deserve your restitution; to which nothing can more conduce, than your peaceable departure, especially where the circumstances are so different: When you left *Venice*, you were conceived to hope a speedy return, by the Popes Arms and Triumph over your own Country; whereas, if you now go away, your departure will be a bsoolutely free from the blemish of that suspicion, and remain to all posterity an Action of pure Heroick Virtue; while, in so tender a case, you prefer the publick before your own present private good. You who could leave a Country, where you were rich and prosperous, merely to comply with the Pope; can you not now depart from a Country, where your selves say, you are poor and afflicted, for the universal good of Religion? Else, will not this pitch of Reluctance favour too rankly of the rich glue which indeed fastens your hearts here; and betray at length to the inquisitive, that your yearly Rents got by the Mission in *England*, are more than ten times as much as what belongs to all Missions besides, both Secular and Regular?

Only this word more: I shall desire you to consider how the Catholicks of *England*, nay of all the World, will be scandalized and provoked against *Jesuit*, if they see you palpably and uncharitably drive on your own Interest alone, without caring what becomes of Religion, unless you may have your wills.

This

This I propose, only upon supposition, that the Report is For, if you endeavour no more than to procure your friends to be included in the Act, without endangering your Negatives. I heartily wish you may prove it just: but, bethink you well of this *Dilemma*; if your solicitings stop the progress of the Act, how will you be hated, as guilty of the commencing those Sanginary Laws? if your endeavours do not stop it, will you be both hated for attempting it, and scorned for carrying it not?

F. I. N. I. S.